arXiv:1610.00575v1 [cs.DS] 3 Oct 2016

Facility Leasing with Penalties

Murilo S. de Lima*[1], Mário C. San Felice†[2], and Orlando Lee‡[1]

[1]Institute of Computing, University of Campinas (Unicamp)
[2]Institute of Mathematics and Statistics, University of São Paulo (USP)

October 4, 2016

Abstract

In this paper we study the facility leasing problem with penalties. We present a primal-dual algorithm which is a 3-approximation, based on the algorithm by Nagarajan and Williamson for the facility leasing problem [NW13] and on the algorithm by Charikar *et al.* for the facility location problem with penalties [CKMN01].

1 Introduction

In the facility location problem, one is given a set F of facilities, an opening cost for each facility, a set D of clients and a metric distance function d between facilities and clients. The objective is to choose a subset of the facilities to open and an assignment between clients and facilities, so to minimize the cost of opening the facilities plus the sum of the distances between each client and the corresponding assigned facility. This is an NP-hard problem, and it does not have a polynomial-time algorithm with approximation factor smaller than 1.463 unless P = NP [Svi02]. Currently the best approximation factor is 1.488, due to an algorithm by Li [Li13].

In the facility location problem with penalties, we may not assign a client j to a facility if we choose to pay a penalty π_j. I.e., we must select a subset of the facilities to open, and a subset of the clients we assign to open facilities; we are going to pay the penalties for the remaining of the clients. The cost of a solution is, therefore, the cost of opening the selected facilities, plus the distance between the client and its corresponding facility for each assigned client, plus the penalty cost for each unassigned client. Clearly the facility location problem reduces to this problem if we set $\pi_j = \infty$ for every client j. Currently it is known a 1.5148-approximation algorithm for this problem [LDXX15]; however, there is a simpler 3-approximation algorithm by Charikar *et al.* [CKMN01]. Also, if the penalties obey a submodular function, then there is a 2-approximation algorithm [LDXX15].

In the facility leasing problem, client requests are distributed along the time, and instead of opening facilities permanently, we may lease each facility for one of K different durations $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_K$. The cost for leasing a facility for δ_k units of time depends on the facility position, as in the traditional facility location problem, but also on the leasing type k. Additionally, it is reasonable to suppose that the leasing costs respect an economics of scale: the leasing cost per unit of time decreases with the leasing duration, for a fixed facility location. A facility lease may begin at any moment in the time. Then, we wish to select a set of facility leases that cover the client requests and minimizes the leasing costs plus the distance between each client and

*mslima@ime.usp.br Supported by FAPESP PhD Scholarship Process 2014/18781-1, and CNPq PhD Scholarship Process 142161/2014-4.

†felice@ic.unicamp.br Supported by CAPES PNPD scholarship 1522390.

‡lee@ic.unicamp.br Partially supported by Bolsa de Produtividade do CNPq Process 311373/2015-1, and Edital Universal CNPq Process 477692/2012-5.

the facility lease that serves each of its requests. This problem was proposed by Nagarajan and Williamson, who presented a simple 3-approximation primal-dual algorithm [NW13].

In this paper, we study the combination of the previous two problems, which we call the **facility leasing problem with penalties** (PFLE). In this problem, facilities are leased instead of permanently opened, as in the facility leasing problem, and some clients may be left unassigned by paying for the penalty cost. We obtain a 3-approximation algorithm by combining the algorithm by Nagarajan and Williamson for the facility leasing problem [NW13] and the algorithm by Charikar *et al.* for the facility location problem with penalties [CKMN01].

The leveraging scheme by Li *et al.* [LDXX15] implies that, for any covering problem with an α-approximation algorithm, there is a $(1 - e^{-1/\alpha})^{-1}$-approximation algorithm for the corresponding covering problem with submodular penalties. Combining this with the algorithm by Nagarajan and Williamson ($\alpha = 3$), one may obtain a 3.5277-approximation algorithm for the facility leasing problem with submodular penalties. Note that our algorithm obtains a better approximation ratio for the linear case.

2 Notation and Problem Definition

Let $[K] := \{1, \ldots, K\}$ be the set of lease types. We denote a facility lease by a triple $f = (p_f, k_f, t_f)$, where $p_f \in V$ is the point where f is located, $k_f \in [K]$ is the leasing type for f, and $t_f \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is the instant of time in which the lease for f begins. We write $\mathcal{F} := F \times [K] \times \mathbb{Z}_+$ so to simplify our notation.

Similarly, we denote a client by a triple $j = (p_j, \pi_j, t_j)$, where $p_j \in V$ is the point where j is located, $\pi_j \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the penalty for not assigning a facility lease to j, and t_j is the instant in which j arrives.

In order to simplify our notation, we write δ_f instead of $\delta(k_f)$, and γ_f instead of $\gamma(p_f, k_f)$, for a facility lease $f = (p_f, k_f, t_f) \in \mathcal{F}$. Also, for $f = (p_f, k_f, t_f) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $j = (p_j, \pi_j, t_j) \in V \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{Z}_+$, we define the distance between j and f to be

$$d(j, f) := \begin{cases} d(p_j, p_f) & \text{if } t_j \in [t_f, t_f + \delta_f), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

I.e., the distance between client j and facility lease f is infinity if the facility lease does not cover t_j.

Problem PFLE$(V, d, F, K, \gamma, \delta, D)$: *The input consists of a set of points V, a distance function $d : V \times V \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ between the points of V satisfying symmetry and triangle inequality, a set $F \subseteq V$ of potential facilities, an integer $K > 0$ that represents the number of lease types, a cost $\gamma(p, k) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for leasing facility $p \in F$ with leasing type $k \in [K]$, a function $\delta : [K] \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ that maps each lease type to a length in days, and a set $D \subseteq V \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{Z}_+$ of clients in the form $j = (p_j, \pi_j, t_j)$. The goal is to find a set $X \subseteq \mathcal{F} := F \times [K] \times \mathbb{Z}_+$ of facility leases in the form $f = (p_f, k_f, t_f)$, and a function $a : D \mapsto X \cup \{\mathsf{null}\}$ that maps each client j to an active facility leasing $f \in X$ such that $t_j \in [t_f, t_f + \delta_f)$ or to null, so to minimize*

$$\sum_{f \in X} \gamma_f + \sum_{j \in D : a(j) \neq \mathsf{null}} d(j, a(j)) + \sum_{j \in D : a(j) = \mathsf{null}} \pi_j.$$

3 Primal-Dual Formulation

- Primal:

$$\begin{array}{rl} \text{minimize} & \sum_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \gamma_f \cdot y_f + \sum_{j\in D}\sum_{f\in\mathcal{F}} d(j,f)\cdot x_{jf} + \sum_{j\in D}\pi_j \cdot z_j \\ \text{subject to} & \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcll} x_{jf} & \leq & y_f & \forall f\in\mathcal{F}, j\in D \\ \sum\limits_{\substack{f\in\mathcal{F} \\ t_j\in[t_f,t_f+\delta_f)}} x_{fj} + z_j & \geq & 1 & \forall j\in D \\ x_{fj}, y_f, z_j & \in & \{0,1\} & \forall f\in\mathcal{F}, j\in D \end{array}$$

(Variable y_f indicates whether facility f was leased, variable x_{jf} indicates whether client j was served by facility lease f, and variable z_j indicates whether the algorithm decided to pay the penalty associated with not serving j with a facility lease.)

- Dual relaxation:

$$\begin{array}{rl} \text{maximize} & \sum_{j\in D}\alpha_j \\ \text{subject to} & \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \sum_{j\in D}(\alpha_j - d(j,f))_+ & \leq & \gamma_f & \forall f\in\mathcal{F} \\ \alpha_j & \leq & \pi_j & \forall j\in D \\ \alpha_j & \geq & 0 & \forall j\in D \end{array}$$

(Economical interpretation: each client j is willing to pay α_j to connect itself to some facility lease. Part of this value covers the distance to the facility; the other part is a contribution to pay for leasing the facility. However, the client is not willing to pay more than its penalty.)

4 Algorithm

Our algorithm is based on the algorithm by Nagarajan and Williamson for the facility leasing problem [NW13], and on the algorithm by Charikar *et al.* for the facility location problem with penalties [CKMN01]. We say that a client j **reaches** a facility lease f if $\alpha_j \geq d(j,f)$.

Algorithm PRIMAL-DUALPFLE$(V, d, F, K, \gamma, \delta, D)$

01 set $\alpha_j \leftarrow 0$ for every $j \in D$
02 $X \leftarrow \emptyset$, $S \leftarrow D$
03 while $S \neq \emptyset$ do
04 increase α_j uniformly for every $j \in S$ until
05 (a) $\alpha_j = d(j,f)$ for some $j \in S$ and $f \in X$
06 or
07 (b) $\gamma_f = \sum_{j\in D}(\alpha_j - d(j,f))_+$ for some $f \in \mathcal{F} \setminus X$
08 or
09 (c) $\alpha_j = \pi_j$ for some $j \in S$
10 $X \leftarrow X \cup \{f \in \mathcal{F} \setminus X : f$ satisfies (b)$\}$
11 $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{j \in S : \alpha_j \geq \pi_j$ or j reaches some $f \in X\}$
12 build the graph G_X with
13 $V[G_X] \leftarrow X$
14 $E[G_X] \leftarrow \{(f,f') : \exists j \in D : j$ reaches both f and $f'\}$
15 build a maximal independent set X' in G_X greedily in decreasing order of δ
16 $\hat{X} \leftarrow \{(p_f, k_f, t_f - \delta_k), f, (p_f, k_f, t_f + \delta_k) : f \in X'\}$

```
17  for every j ∈ D do
18      if j reaches some f ∈ X then
19          a(j) ← arg min_{f'∈X̂} {d(j, f')}
20      else
21          a(j) ← null
22  return (X̂, a)
```

The algorithm maintains a dual variable α_j for each client $j \in D$, a set X of temporarily leased facilities, and a set S of the clients whose dual variable still is being increased, which is initialized with the whole set of clients D. The increasing pauses when either: (a) a client reaches an already temporarily leased facility, (b) the sum of the contributions towards a facility lease pays for its cost or (c) the dual variable reaches the penalty cost for some client. We then add to X the facilities that reach condition (b). Also, we remove from S the clients that reach some temporarily leased facility or whose dual variable pays for the penalty cost, and then proceed the increasing of the remaining dual variables until S becomes empty.

After that initial phase, we build an interference graph G_X between the facility leases in X. Graph G_X has vertex set X and has an edge between facilities f and f' if there is some client that reaches both f and f'. Then, we order set X by decreasing order of lease duration and build a maximal independent set X' in a greedily manner; i.e., we visit set X in that order and add a facility f to X' if there is no other facility lease $f' \in X'$ reached by some client that reaches f. Thus X' satisfies the following properties:

1. Every client reaches at most one facility lease in X';
2. If facility leases f and f' in X are reached by the same client j, and if $f' \in X'$, then $\delta_f \leq \delta_{f'}$.

However, note that there may be some client j that reaches some f in X but is not covered by any facility lease in X'. But then remember that some $f' \in X'$ shares a reaching client j' with f, thus $\delta_f \leq \delta_{f'}$ and the intervals covered by facility leases f and f' overlap. Then, since we buy $\hat{X}$, which has three copies of f', beginning at instants $t_{f'} - \delta_{f'}$, $t_{f'}$ and $t_{f'} + \delta_{f'}$, we have that the interval formed by those three facilities, which is $[t_{f'} - \delta_{f'}, t_{f'} + 2\delta_{f'})$, is a superset of interval $[t_f, t_f + \delta_f)$, and therefore one of them covers t_j.

Finally, if some client j does not reach any facility lease in X, then its dual variable pays for its penalty and we set $a(j)$ to null.

Also, note that, although the number of potential facility leases is infinite, the algorithm may be implemented in finite time, which is also polynomial in the input size: it is enough to consider, for every facility point, a lease beginning at each instant in which we have a client request.

5 Analysis

In this section we analyze the approximation factor of algorithm Primal-DualPFLe.

First note that, since the conditions (a), (b) and (c) correspond to constraints of the relaxation of the dual program, we have that α is a feasible dual solution. Therefore, by weak duality, we have that

$$\sum_{j \in D} \alpha_j \leq \text{opt}(V, d, F, K, \gamma, \delta, D).$$

We will show, then, that the cost of the primal solution $(\hat{X}, a)$ returned by the algorithm is at most 3 times the cost of the dual solution, and thus our algorithm is a 3-approximation to problem PFLe.

For every client $j \in D$, we define numbers α_j^C, α_j^F, and α_j^P in the following manner:

1. If j reaches some $f \in X'$, then let
$$\alpha_j^C := d(j, f), \quad \alpha_j^F := \alpha_j - d(f, j), \quad \alpha_j^P := 0;$$
2. If j does not reach any facility lease in X' but reaches some $f \in X$, then we let
$$\alpha_j^C := \alpha_j, \quad \alpha_j^F := 0, \quad \alpha_j^P := 0;$$
3. Finally, if j does not reach any facility lease in X, then we let
$$\alpha_j^C := 0, \quad \alpha_j^F := 0, \quad \alpha_j^P := \alpha_j.$$

Note that, either case, we have that

$$\alpha_j = \alpha_j^C + \alpha_j^F + \alpha_j^P.$$

Now, first let us bound the facility leasing cost. Note that, by construction, we have that, for every $f \in X'$, every client that reaches f reaches only f in X'. Also, by case (b) of the algorithm, the leasing cost of f is totally paid by contributions from clients that reach f. Therefore, we have that

$$\sum_{f \in X'} \gamma_f = \sum_{j \in D} \alpha_j^F.$$

Since $\hat{X}$, which is the set of facility leases actually bought by the algorithm, consists of three copies of each facility lease in X', we have that

$$\sum_{f \in \hat{X}} \gamma_f \leq 3 \cdot \sum_{j \in D} \alpha_j^F.$$

Now we bound the penalty cost. We have that a client j has $a(j)$ set to null if and only if it does not reach any facility lease in X, and then $\alpha_j = \alpha_j^P$. Also, due to case (c) of the algorithm, we have that $\alpha_j = \pi_j$. Thus, it is straightforward to conclude that

$$\sum_{j \in D : a(j) = \mathsf{null}} \pi_j = \sum_{j \in D} \alpha_j^P.$$

Finally, we have to bound the client connection cost. Let $D_{X'}$ be the set of clients that reach some facility in X'. Note that those clients are connected to the closest facility lease in $\hat{X}$. Since every such client j reaches some $f \in X'$, we have that

$$d(j, a(j)) \leq d(j, f) = \alpha_j^C.$$

Now let j be some client that reaches some $f \in X$ but does not reach any facility lease in X'. There must be some $f' \in X'$ and some j' that reaches both f and f', by construction of X'. But then we must have that $\alpha_j \geq \alpha_{j'}$, since when $\alpha_{j'}$ stopped increasing it reached both f and f', and α_j reached f when it stopped increasing. Then, since j' reaches both f and f', we have that

$$\alpha_{j'} \geq d(j', f) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{j'} \geq d(j', f').$$

Since one of the three copies of f' in $\hat{X}$ must cover t_j, by triangle inequality, we have that

$$d(j, a(j)) \leq d(j, f') \leq d(j, f) + d(j', f) + d(j', f') \leq \alpha_j + \alpha_{j'} + \alpha_{j'} \leq 3 \cdot \alpha_j = 3 \cdot \alpha_j^C.$$

Summing up the previous inequalities, we have that

$$\sum_{f \in \hat{X}} \gamma_f + \sum_{j \in D : a(j) \neq \mathsf{null}} d(j, a(j)) + \sum_{j \in D : a(j) = \mathsf{null}} \pi_j \leq 3 \cdot \sum_{j \in D} \alpha_j \leq 3 \cdot \mathrm{opt}(V, d, F, K, \gamma, \delta, D),$$

and we conclude the following theorem.

Theorem 1: *Algorithm* Primal-DualPFLe *is a 3-approximation.*

References

[CKMN01] M. Charikar, S. Khuller, D. M. Mount, and G. Narasimhan. Algorithms for facility location problems with outliers. In *SODA'01: Proceedings of the 12th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 642–651, 2001.

[LDXX15] Y. Li, D. Du, N. Xiu, and D. Xu. Improved approximation algorithms for the facility location problems with linear/submodular penalties. *Algorithmica*, 73(2):460–482, 2015.

[Li13] S. Li. A 1.488 approximation algorithm for the uncapacitated facility location problem. *Information and Computation*, 222:45–58, 2013.

[NW13] C. Nagarajan and D. P. Williamson. Offline and online facility leasing. *Discrete Optimization*, 10(4):361–370, 2013.

[Svi02] M. Sviridenko. An improved approximation algorithm for the metric uncapacitated facility location problem. In W. J. Cook and A. S. Schulz, editors, *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, volume 2337 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 240–257. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2002.